

(1).

**FILED**

JUL 19 2022

CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPUTY CLERKUnited States District Court  
EASTERN District of California  
AttentionDistrict Court  
number(s)

R. MAURICE MILES, SR.

2:19-cv-01881

MCE  
CKDTHE POET  
Plaintiff

Plaintiff

V. GARLAND ET AL.

Motion to

And PEOPLE of THE STATE

move THE

of CALIFORNIA ET AL.

COURT judges

Defendant(s)

To Re-open

FEDERAL QUESTION

All following

1331 1332

EASTERN DISTRICT COURT

1333 1334

CASES; AND GRANT RELIEF

42 U.S.C.S.

Plaintiff seek from

1986

All CASES ABOVE AND

NIXON V.

BELOW in THE NAME of

U.S. 1974

"JUSTICE"

MARYLAND

2:21-cv-01143-TLN-DB (HC)

V. BRADY

2:21-cv-00989-KJM-AC (PC)

1963

2:14-cv-02196-TLN-EFB (HC)

NIXON V.

1:14-cv-01683-SKO (PC)

1803

1:14-cv-01606-SKO (HC)

ERICKSON

Plaintiff's DUE PROCESS HAS

WASHINGTON

UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT 151

1984

4th 5th 6th 7th 8th and 14th

Amendment VIOLATIONS...

Plaintiff SEEK RELIEF

FROM THESE PARTIES

VIOLATIONS

(2)

(1). Plaintiff seek "Relief" from  
 THE ABOVE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT  
 CASES IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE...  
 RE-OPEN ALL THE CASES THAT'S BEEN  
 CLOSED DUE TO UNFAIR COMPETITION  
 AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS...  
 Plaintiff was "falsely charged"  
 and "convicted" on FALSE AND  
 PERJURED TESTIMONY AND/OR  
 EVIDENCE, FROM A 2011 CASE;  
 WHERE Plaintiff WAS ULTIMATELY  
 FOUND "NOT GUILTY" FOR CHARGES  
 AND/OR COUNTS (1); (2); (3); (4); AND  
 (5) (REF: MARBURY V. MADISON 1803  
 6th U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT  
 SPRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON 1984  
 TITLE VI CIVIL RIGHTS ACT 1964)  
 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 FOUND Plaintiff "NOT GUILTY"...  
 THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
 FAIL TO PROVE HIS CASE BEYOND  
 A REASONABLE DOUBT... ALSO SEE  
 NIXON V. U.S. 1974.

(2)

IT IS A REQUIREMENT THAT

(3).

2 CANNOT BE DEEMED TO BE SATISFIED  
 3 BY MERELY NOTICE AND HEARING IF A  
 4 STATE HAS CONTRIVED A CONVICTION  
 5 THROUGH THE PRETENSE OF A TRIAL  
 6 WHICH IN TRUTH IS BUT USED AS A  
 7 MEANS OF DEPRIVING A DEFENDANT  
 8 OF LIBERTY THROUGH A DELIBERATE  
 9 DECEPTION OF COURT AND JURY BY  
 10 THE PRESENTATION OF "TESTIMONY"  
 11 KNOWN TO BE PERJURED... SUCH  
 12 A CONTRIVANCE BY A STATE TO  
 13 PROCURE THE CONVICTION AND  
 14 IMPRISONMENT OF A DEFENDANT  
 15 IS AS INCONSISTENT WITH THE  
 16 RUDIMENTARY DEMANDS OF  
 17 JUSTICE AS IS THE OBTAINING OF A  
 18 LIKE RESULT BY INTIMIDATION...  
 19 SEE ALMEIDA V. BALDI 195 F.2D 815 33;  
 20 THOMPSON V. DYE 221 F.2D 763  
 21 MOONEY V. HOFFMAN; 294 U.S. 103, 112  
 22 55 S CT 340 342...

(3)

25 IN PYLE V. KANSAS 317 U.S. 213, 215  
 26 216, 63 S CT 177, 178, 87 L ED 214:

27 PETITIONER'S PAPER'S ARE INEXPERTLY  
 28 DRAWN. BUT THEY DO SET FORTH



(4).

ALLEGATIONS THAT HIS IMPRISONMENT  
 RESULTED FROM PERJURED  
 TESTIMONY KNOWINGLY USED BY  
 THE STATE AUTHORITIES TO OBTAIN HIS  
 CONVICTION AND FROM THE DELIBERATE  
 SUPPRESSION BY THOSE SAME  
 AUTHORITIES OF EVIDENCE FAVORABLE  
 TO HIM... THESE ALLEGATIONS  
 SUFFICIENTLY CHARGE A DEPRIVATION  
 OF RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE  
 FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, AND IF  
 PROVEN WOULD ENTITLE PETITIONER  
 TO BE RELEASE FROM HIS PRESENT  
 CUSTODY; MOORE V. HOLOHAN 294 U.S.  
 103, 55 S Ct 340, 79 L Ed 791...

(4).

NADVE V. ILLINOIS 360 U.S. 244 269  
 79 S Ct 1173, 3 L Ed. 2d 1217.

THE SAME RESULT OBTAINS WHEN THE  
 STATE, ALTHOUGH NOT SOLICITING FALSE  
 EVIDENCE ALLOWS IT TO GO UNCORRECTED  
 WHEN IT APPEARS... AND SEE  
 ALCORTA V. TEXAS 362 U.S. 607, 80 S Ct  
 103 2 L Ed. 2d 9.; WILDEY V. WYOMING  
 362 U.S. 607, 80 S Ct 900 4 L Ed 985 cf.  
 DUKLEY V. N.Y. 351 U.S. 277, 285, 76  
 S Ct 806 811 100...

(5)

THE COURT NOW HOLD THAT.  
 SUPPRESSION BY THE PROSECUTION  
 OF EVIDENCE FAVORABLE TO AN  
 ACCUSED UPON REQUEST VIOLATES  
 DUE PROCESS WHERE THE EVIDENCE  
 IS MATERIAL EITHER TO GUILT OR  
 TO PUNISHMENT; IRRESPECTIVE OF  
 THE GOOD FAITH OR ~~BAD~~ FAITH OF  
 THE PROSECUTION... SEE GILES V.  
 STATE 229 N.D. 370 183 A 2d 359  
 WHEELER V. STATE 42 MD 563, 570  
 BEIL V. STATE 57 MD 108, 120  
 BEARD V. STATE 71 MD 275, 280 17  
 1044, 1045  
 DICK V. STATE 107 MD 11, 21 68 A 286,  
 290 cf.  
 VOGEL V. STATE 163 MD 267 162 A 705.

(5).

SEE PLAINTIFF'S CASE in  
 2:21-CV-00989-KJM-AC (PC)  
 NILES V. SCHUBERT ET AL FILED  
 6-3-2021... In THIS CASE  
 PLAINTIFF APPEAL FROM THE  
 ILLEGAL ACT'S THAT HAS BEEN ENPOSED  
 AGAINST Him, and SEEK RELIEF FROM  
 THOSE PROCEEDINGS... PLAINTIFF

(6).

is now DETAINED AT A "STATE"  
 "HOSPITAL", DUE TO AN INEFFECTIVE,  
INCOMPETENT LAZY LOS ANGELES  
 "PUBLIC DEFENDER" AND/OR "JAN LESS"  
 "RACKETEER FRAUD COURT SYSTEM"  
 WHERE DETAINEES ARE BEING FOUND  
 INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL  
 FOR NO VALID OR REASONABLE  
 REASON ETC ETC ETC...

(6) THE KYLES COURT  
 SPECIFICALLY STATED THAT THE  
 PROSECUTION HAS A DUTY TO DISCLOSE  
 MATERIAL EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE  
 THAT THE DEFENSE MIGHT USE TO  
 ATTACK THE CHARACTER AND  
 SUBSTANCE OF THE "COMMONWEALTH'S"  
 INVESTIGATION IN SHORT; EVIDENCE  
 OF SHODDY POLICE WORK CAN BE  
 EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE FOR THE  
 DEFENDANT...

THERE ARE ANY NUMBER  
 OF WAYS DEFENSE COUNSEL CAN  
 INDUCE DISCLOSURE OF MISTAKE  
 OR BAD FAITH IN A POLICE  
 INVESTIGATION... REQUEST ARE BEST  
 DIRECTED AT EVIDENCE REGARDING



(7)

OTHER POTENTIAL OR ACTUAL  
SUSPECT'S LEAD'S AND INFORMANT'S  
THAT THE POLICE WERE AWARE OF  
AND PRIOR INCONSISTENT  
STATEMENTS OR IDENTIFICATIONS...

AS THE KYLES COURT SUGGESTS  
EVIDENCE THAT POLICE DID NOT  
PURSUE CERTAIN SUSPECTS OR  
LEADS DIRECTLY RELATES TO  
THE QUALITY OF THE INVESTIGATION  
AND MAY BE EXCULPATORY TO  
THE DEFENSE...

KYLES MAKES CLEAR THAT  
THE PROSECUTOR MUST ACCOUNT  
FOR ALL "COMMONWEALTH ACTORS"  
AND ANY EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE  
GATHERED BY THOSE "ACTORS" IN  
ORDER TO FULFILL ITS  
RESPONSIBILITY. [THE INDIVIDUAL  
PROSECUTOR HAS A DUTY TO LEARN  
OF ANY FAVORABLE EVIDENCE  
KNOWN TO THE OTHER ACTING ON  
THE GOVERNMENT'S BEHALF IN  
THE CASE, INCLUDING THE POLICE...  
IN ORDER TO TARGET ALL POSSIBLE  
LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
[REDACTED] TO THE PROSECUTOR;  
FLOWING

(8)

- 1 DEFENSE ATTORNEYS in THEIR
- 2 DISCOVERY motions SHOULD
- 3 REQUEST SUCH information FROM
- 4 ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTORS...
- 5 UNITED STATES V. SPERLING 726 F.2d 71
- 6 72 (1984); KING V. PONTA 717 F.2d 635
- 7 CA1 (1984); UNITED STATES V. OXMAN 740
- 8 F.2d 1298, 1311 (1984) UNITED STATES V.
- 9 HASTING 461 U.S. 499, 516, 517 (1983)
- 10 ALSO SEE THE TENCH ACT 18 U.S.C. § 3500;
- 11 CALIFORNIA V. TROMBETTA 467 U.S. 479
- 12 488 (1984); BERGER V. U.S. 295
- 13 U.S. 78, 88 (1935); FAHEY V.
- 14 CONNECTICUT 375 U.S. 85, 86, 87 (1963)
- 15 U.S. V. BURR F. CAS 3036 (1807)
- 16 U.S. EX. REL THOMPSON V. DYE 221
- 17 F.163, 765 (1955); PETER V. KIFF 407
- 18 U.S. 493 (1972); ASHLEY V. TEXAS 319
- 19 F.2d 80 CAS (1963); ENGEL V. ISAAC
- 20 456 U.S. 107, 133, 134 (1982)
- 21 BLAKE V. ZANT, 513 F. SUPP 772
- 22 (1981); BURGER V. ZANT 467 U.S. 1212
- 23 1213 (1984); FRANCIS V. FRANKLIN
- 24 471 U.S. 307 (1985); HOLLOWAY V.
- 25 ARKANSAS 435 U.S. 475, 482 (1978)
- 26 CUTLER V. SULLIVAN; 446 U.S. 335, 348
- 27 (1980); GLASSER V. U.S. 315 U.S. 60, 92
- 28



(9).

(7). ATTENTION UNITED STATES  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN  
DISTRICT, "CLERK(S)" PLAINTIFF  
MOVE AND/OR COMPEL THE ABOVE  
COURT CASES "JUDGES" TO GRANT  
RELIEF HE SEEK IN THE NAME  
OF JUSTICE

SUBMISSION DATE: 7-13-2022  
Signed: Min Min. Sr.  
The Poet